REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 7-13, and 28-29 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12, and 13 are the independent claims. Claims 2-5 and 7-11 stand withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1, 12, and 13 have been amended. Applicants submit that support for these amendments can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 12-13, and 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,334,187 (Kadano) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,449,377 (Rhoads) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,875,249 (Mintzer et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse that rejection for the reasons discussed below.

The present invention recited in independent Claim 1 relates to a data processing apparatus having (1) detection means for detecting whether an illegal process has been performed for input digital contents on the basis of a result indicating whether a digital watermark is correctly embedded to the digital contents and (2) embedding means for embedding a visible or invisible digital watermark to the digital contents when the detection means detects that an illegal process has been performed. As recited in Claim 1, when the digital watermark is correctly embedded in the digital contents, the same digital watermark has been embedded by using an identical algorithm with respect to each of plural areas constituting the digital contents of one screen. The detection means extracts the digital watermarks from all the areas corresponding to the one screen and judges that an illegal process has been performed when one or more of the extracted digital watermarks is different from the other extracted digital watermarks. Independent Claims 12 and 13 recite

7

similar features.

Due to the above-mentioned features, it is possible to detect not only an illegal alteration of digital contents, but also the location where the illegal alteration was performed.

Applicants submit that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of the present invention recited in Claims 1, 12, and 13. Kadano discloses that secret information is embedded in an image using plural embedding methods. The secret information embedded using the respective embedding methods is extracted and compared with the other extracted information, and a process for coping with damage to the secret information is performed when the comparison indicates the extracted secret information is not the same. However, that patent does not disclose or suggest that the same digital watermark has been embedded by using an identical algorithm with respect to each of plural areas constituting the digital contents of one screen. Accordingly, that patent does not disclose or suggest the above-mentioned features of Claims 1, 12, and 13.

The other cited art does not disclose anything that would remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Kadano. In particular, neither Rhoads nor Mintzer discloses or suggests that when a digital watermark is correctly embedded, the same digital watermark has been embedded by using an identical algorithm with respect to each of plural areas constituting the digital contents of one screen. Therefore, even if the cited art is combined, the combination would not disclose or suggest every feature of the invention as recited in Claims 1, 12, and 13.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the present invention recited in independent Claims 1, 12, and 13 is patentable over the cited art. The dependent claims are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as

for the additional features they recite.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants
Brian L. Klock
Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

BLK/lmj

DC_MAIN 159103v1

9